

Manuscript: “**Caractérisation des périmètres maraîchers institués par les groupements des femmes comme stratégie de résilience en zone post conflit (Casamance, Sénégal)**”

Submitted: 25 January 2021

Accepted: 07 April 2021

Published: 30 April 2021

Corresponding Author: Ousmane Ndiaye

Doi:10.19044/esj.2021.v17n13p118

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Adéréwa A. M. Amontcha Yabi, Université d’Abomey-Calavi (UAC)

Reviewer 2: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Reviewer Name: Adéréwa A. M. AMONTCHA YABI	Email:
University/Country: Université d'Abomey-Calavi (UAC)	
Date Manuscript Received: 04/02/2021	Date Review Report Submitted: 14/02/2021
Manuscript Title: Caractérisation des périmètres maraîchers institués par les groupements des femmes comme stratégie de résilience en zone post conflit (Casamance, Sénégal)	
ESJ Manuscript Number: 20.02.2021---complete paper---	
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes/No	

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

La raison justificative de l'étude qui est ressorti dans l'objectif n'est pas pertinente et la méthode de traitement des données n'est pas ressortie.	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Il y a plusieurs phrases dépourvues de sens qui méritent d'être reformulées et plusieurs phrases sans suite logique avec celles qui les précèdent, qui nécessitent que les agencements soient revus.	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Les critères de choix des enquêtés ne sont pas claires et la méthode de traitement des données n'est pas bien fournie.	
5. The results are clear and do not contain errors.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> Plusieurs phrases et titres nécessitent d'être reformulés pour la clarté des résultats	
6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	4
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i> La conclusion présente un résultat non développé dans la partie résultat ; la conclusion ne dit pas en quoi les résultats de l'étude seront utiles.	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	5
<i>(Please insert your comments)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):